

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION

GRADY RENARD WILLIAMS, JR.,)	
a/k/a Abdul Malik Bey,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. CV422-201
)	
WARDEN TIMOTHY C. WARD,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

O R D E R

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's August 24, 2022, Report and Recommendation (Doc. 7), to which Petitioner has objected (Doc. 9). After a careful review of the record,¹ Petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**, and the report and recommendation (Doc. 7) is **ADOPTED** as the Court's opinion in this case. Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Petition (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED**. Petitioner's Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Doc. 8) is **DENIED** as moot. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to close this case.

The Magistrate Judge recommended that Petitioner's Petition be dismissed as untimely, explaining that Petitioner's arguments

¹ The Court reviews de novo a magistrate judge's findings to which a party objects, and the Court reviews for clear error the portions of a report and recommendation to which a party does not object. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see Merchant v. Nationwide Recovery Serv., Inc., 440 F. Supp. 3d 1369, 1371 (N.D. Ga. 2020) (outlining the standard of review for report and recommendations (citing Macort v. Prem, Inc., 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam))).

for timeliness failed. (Doc. 7 at 5, 7.) The Magistrate Judge also explained that Petitioner's allegations concerning the state court's jurisdiction over his criminal case "are indicative of the entirely discredited 'Sovereign Citizen' theory." (Id. at 6.) Petitioner's response to the report and recommendation merely repeats the same arguments concerning the state court's jurisdiction over him and frivolous "Sovereign Citizen" theories the Magistrate Judge properly rejected. (Doc. 9.) Since Petitioner's response does not advance any non-frivolous argument that the Magistrate Judge erred, his objections are **OVERRULED**.

Applying the Certificate of Appealability (COA) standards set forth in Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at *1-2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009), the Court discerns no COA-worthy issues at this stage of the litigation, so no COA should issue either. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts ("The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.").

SO ORDERED this 26th day of September 2022.



WILLIAM T. MOORE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA